

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 21, 2013

ART Members: Steve Langworthy, Planning Director; Al Woo, Fire Chief; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Administrator; Laura Ball, Landscape Architect; and Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Justin Goodwin, Planner II; Jennifer Rauch, Planner II; Jordan Fromm, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Jeffrey Haines, Gainar Consulting for Sprint; Thomas Beery, Beery Architects, Inc.; Oliver Damschroder, American Structurepoint; and Kurt Schmitt, Property Owner.

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the November 14, 2013, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

1. 13-112ARTW – Sprint Wireless Rooftop Co-Location – 425 Metro Place South

Rachel Ray said this request by Sprint was introduced last week to replace three antennas and two equipment cabinets and install six new remote radio units and three fiber optic cables on the roof of an office building located approximately 500 feet west of the intersection of Metro Place South and Frantz Road. She said this is a request for review and approval of a wireless communications facility under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Ray said the three new panel antennas are similar in size and shape to the existing panels. She said the antenna panels are approximately six feet tall, and will be installed at a height of approximately 84 feet above grade to the center point of the antenna panels. She said these will be installed alongside the existing antennas on a new mounting bracket and the new cabinets alongside the existing cabinets within the rooftop screening area. Ms. Ray said it is Planning's recommendation for approval for the switch out with the following conditions:

1. That the antennas and cabinets are painted beige to match the adjacent building wall;
2. That the fiber optic cable color to be as unobtrusive as possible;
3. That any associated cables or wires to be trimmed to fit closely to the panels;
4. That the existing antenna panels and equipment cabinets be removed within six months following the installation of the new panels and cabinets; and
5. That the applicant removes the mounting brackets for the existing antennas to be replaced and covers any openings/holes left in the building wall.

Steve Langworthy asked about the condition about requiring the surface within the equipment area to be repaired once the old cabinets are removed.

Ms. Ray suggested an additional condition stating, "that the applicant cover any openings left from the removal of the existing cabinets and level and eliminate anything protruding on the abandoned pad area."

Mr. Langworthy asked if it could be incorporated into condition 5. He asked the applicant if he understood the conditions.

Mr. Haines responded that he understood and agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments regarding this application. [There were none]. He concluded that the Administrative Review Team approves this wireless communications co-location application under the provision of Chapter 99 of the Dublin Code of Ordinances with 5 conditions.

CASE REVIEW

2. 13-107MPR – BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District – Christoff Retail Center – 6465 Sawmill Road

Justin Goodwin said this is a request for review and approval of a new 3,064-square-foot Commercial Center Building and associated site improvements at 6465 Sawmill Road within the BSC Sawmill Center Neighborhood District. He said the site is on the west side of Sawmill Road approximately 450 feet north of West Dublin-Granville Road. He said this Minor Project Review application is proposed in accordance with Zoning Code Section 153.065(G).

Mr. Goodwin said that this application was introduced to the Administrative Review Team at the October 24, 2013 meeting and reviewed at the October 31, 2013 meeting. He said the applicant has resubmitted their application and the new target date for determination is slated for December 5, 2013. Mr. Goodwin said Thomas Beery, Beery Architects, Inc. is representing Chris Christoff today as well as Oliver Damschroder, American Structurepoint.

Mr. Goodwin said that several revisions have been made since the introduction. He said Mr. Christoff has spoken with potential tenants who desire a ground sign, which will push the building back to comply with the Code required building zone requirement of between 5 feet - 25 feet.

Mr. Goodwin said the revised plans show the 3,064-square-foot building beyond the 25-foot maximum required building zone (RBZ), parallel to the public sidewalk. He said the building would need to be pushed back into the RBZ. He said the one foot shift in the building and adjacent walk may result in the edge of the monument sign to be located directly adjacent to the walkway. He said the proposed sign is 6-feet tall and 8-feet wide, placed 8-feet back from the minimum RBZ, which equates to a 13-foot setback from the front lot line. Mr. Goodwin suggested extending the landscape beds along the walkway to visually integrate the sign into the landscape design, perhaps minimizing the awkward placement. He said that extending beds along the entire front walkway would help create a more cohesive landscape design along the full building frontage.

Mr. Goodwin referred to the revised parking lot plans, which now include five parking spaces on the south side of the building, with the central row of parking spaces in the parking lot behind the building eliminated for a new continuous landscape island in the center. He noted that 22 spaces were reflected on the site plan.

Mr. Goodwin said that since the application was not specific to one tenant or two, two sets of elevations were submitted for the potential configurations. He described the different elevations, including the door configurations and signs. He said the plans show a 50/50 split of retail and restaurant space but the floor plans do not correlate. He said that if the larger space is used for a restaurant, the site would be one parking space short.

Tom Beery confirmed with Mr. Goodwin that a shared parking arrangement could be an option in that situation.

Mr. Goodwin referred to the dumpster and noted that the enclosure is constructed with the same brick as the building. He asked the applicant to select a color other than bright yellow to paint the bollards adjacent to the dumpster enclosure. He suggested a dark color with a reflective band.

Mr. Goodwin said the size of the proposed monument sign with a dedicated tenant panel does not work with two potential tenants, unless the applicant determines that the larger tenant gets the monument sign and the other tenant only gets a wall mounted sign. He questioned the lighting for the ground-mounted sign and said that if it were to be internally illuminated, all wiring would need to be hidden inside or underground.

Mr. Beery said that sign lighting plans would depend on the sign packages selected by the tenants.

Steve Langworthy asked if light fixtures for the building had been selected.

Mr. Beery said the light fixtures had not been selected but they were considering some sort of lantern design.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the rooftop mechanicals would be appropriately screened.

Mr. Beery said he believed that the parapet height shown would provide adequate screening, but in the event it was not tall enough, the roof could be lowered to create a taller parapet.

Mr. Langworthy commented on the proposed canopy and referenced the Code intent that canopies should offer "protection against the elements" and he was not sure that the proposed canopies at the height shown would accomplish this.

Mr. Goodwin said he had discussed the landscape plan with Todd Foley, the landscape architect for the project, and said that his recommendations would be sent to the applicants via email. He referred to the proposed pocket plaza and said the design intent is not met with the landscaping plan and neither is the intent of the foundation landscaping requirement. He suggested that where there is no sidewalk, a continuous mulch bed should be provided around the building including groupings of bushes and low-growing plants in front of the storefront window bays.

He said that 80 percent of the landscape bed surface area must be covered by living plant material rather than exposed mulch. He stated that the proposed pocket plaza includes a square-shaped area designated as the required open space containing a bench and lawn area. He said that in addition to relocating the bike parking to this area and adding more trees and plantings to define the area, Planning would like to see more hardscape with a minimum 40 percent street frontage to meet the requirements for a pocket plaza. He suggested adding more pervious pavers in this area and placing the bench next to the paver area.

Mr. Langworthy recommended that a trash can be located in the pocket plaza, especially if there is to be a restaurant in the building.

Barb Cox recommended relocating the stormwater inlet shown at the edge of the central parking lot island into the island itself, and designing the island for stormwater management with curb breaks for drainage from the lot. She said this will require the use of an alternative tree species that can survive wet conditions. Ms. Cox referenced the City's Stormwater Management Design Manual, which includes minimum design requirements for management facilities. She said it was the City's intent to integrate stormwater management practices into the overall site and building design, such as disconnected downspouts, rather than underground storage. She said that underground stormwater management practices become difficult to maintain over time.

Laura Ball recommended Skyline Honey Locust as a potential tree species for the parking lot island.

Fred Hahn asked if the island would be curbed.

Ms. Cox said they need at least one break in it to allow for proper drainage.

Mr. Goodwin asked Ms. Ball to address the specific species she had concerns with.

Ms. Ball recommended using an Inkberry as opposed to Boxwood and replacing the Knockout Roses with a selection of perennials.

Mr. Goodwin stated that he had sent the applicant a copy of a template for the public access easement for the pocket plaza.

Mr. Langworthy asked why parking blocks were shown in the parking spaces to the rear of the building but not the south side.

Mr. Goodwin said they were required for the ADA-accessible spaces that were flush with the sidewalk.

Mr. Damschroder confirmed that all six spaces adjacent to the rear of the building were flush with the sidewalk.

Mr. Langworthy asked the ART if there were any additional questions or concerns. [There were none.]

Mr. Goodwin concluded that the time extension for a determination on this proposal resulting from the resubmitted plans puts the target determination date at December 5, 2013.

3. 13-113MPR-ARB – BSC Historic Residential – Schmitt Residence – 97 South Riverview Street

Jennifer Rauch said this is a request for a Minor Project Review for the construction of a new single-family dwelling at the northwest corner of the intersection with South Riverview Street and Pinney Hill. She said this case was introduced last week by Rachel Ray. She said the Architectural Review Board had approved the demolition of the existing home on the property prior to approval of a new building permit because of the condition of the house. The applicant has returned to the Administrative Review Team with a proposal to construct a new house. Ms. Rauch said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project in accordance with Zoning Code Sections 153.063(B) and 153.170.

Ms. Rauch said the residence is oriented with the principal entrance on Pinney Hill, an outdoor area is located within the South Riverview Street frontage, and the garage entrance is along Blacksmith Lane. She said it currently meets most of the standards for the BSC Historic Residential District with the exception of the 52 percent lot coverage when the Code requirement is 50 percent. Ms. Rauch said the other exception is the driveway along the northern property line, which is only about 1.5 feet from the property line and needs to meet the three-foot setback requirement.

Ms. Rauch said the flat roof portion of the proposed building had been modified since the initial submittal as part of the demolition request but Planning still has concerns with the size of the flat area.

Steve Langworthy asked about the material palette.

Ms. Rauch said the roof material was a combination of standing seam with asphalt shingles on the main part of the house. She said cementitious siding will be used as well as limestone on windows and sills. She said the natural stone selected is beige and the standing seam is gray.

Kurt Schmitt, property owner, said he had met with an arborist to discuss the site as two of the trees on the lot, which are landmark trees, appear to have never been trimmed properly. He said the top of one of the trees is all broken as well as the tree located on the back lot line, which would also be a concern for the adjoining property owner. Mr. Schmitt said the rest of the landmark trees are fine and are not proposed to be removed.

Ms. Rauch said the damaged trees can be removed and that they do not need to be replaced; however, the change will need to be reflected on the plans.

Mr. Schmitt believed he had addressed the Administrative Review Team's concerns about the flat roof and asked if he would be able to add an 8-foot by 8-foot greenhouse in that area that she could access from the second story of the garage. He said it would not be visible from the Pinney Hill or North Riverview street frontages. He said that the lot coverage is an issue on this small lot.

Fred Hahn asked about Planning's concern with the flat roof.

Ms. Rauch said there is no requirement that prohibit a flat roof but Planning is more concerned about the amount of flat roof area. She added that the City's architectural consultant, as well as the ARB, had previously expressed concerns with the amount of flat roof area.

Mr. Langworthy asked about the rail color.

Mr. Schmitt said it will be white.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Schmitt if he had anything to add to Ms. Rauch's overview of the proposal.

Mr. Schmitt asked about the possibility of installing a generator and possible condenser unit on the site and requested an opinion on the best location. He suggested that if a greenhouse was erected on the roof, the generator could be placed between the greenhouse and the adjacent gable to the south. Mr. Schmitt said his other option is to place them on the north wall of the home.

Ms. Rauch asked the ART of their thoughts on the greenhouse and the flat roof area.

Mr. Schmitt said the flat roof deck is really serving as a connector to the garage since there is no basement for storage.

Mr. Hahn said the flat roof area and greenhouse do not concern him.

Mr. Langworthy asked Mr. Schmitt to consider the maintenance of a flat roof.

Mr. Schmitt said it has to be done right. He said the greenhouse floor will have giant pavers.

Mr. Langworthy asked each ART member if they had any additional questions or concerns.

Mr. Hahn asked about the maneuverability space for the garage in relation to the property line.

Mr. Schmitt said it would cost less to build a rear-facing garage, but it would then be directly across from other neighbor and no longer as aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Rauch said the driveway width needs to be less than 26 feet at the curb line and 20 feet at the right-of-way. She asked about the improvements along Pinney Hill.

Mr. Schmitt said they plan on tan pea gravel for the area in front of the home's main entrance.

Barb Cox said she completed a preliminary review of the home as Engineering would look at it when it comes in for a building permit and a lot more dimensions and detail will be necessary for the driveway and overall grading to make sure it does not drain towards the adjacent property.

Mr. Schmitt explained that it is complicated, given the existing stone wall on the back property line.

Ms. Cox recommended grading the driveway off the side street. She said it needs to have a slope that does not exceed 8 percent. She reiterated the need for elevation details for the first floor, basement floor slab, top of block, and garage floor. Ms. Cox said in order for the review for building permits to go smoothly, the sanitary sewer lateral location needs to be identified as well as the location and size of the water service tap.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any remaining concerns.

Mr. Hahn stated that the City would like the tag from the dead landmark tree when it is removed.

Ms. Rauch said an architectural consultant is reviewing this proposal and the target Administrative Review Team determination is December 5, 2013.

INTRODUCTIONS

NONE

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further items of discussion. [There were none.]
The meeting was adjourned.